IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MELISSA BEIDEMAN

265 Austin Dr.

Fairless Hills, PA 19030 : CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff, : No.:

V.

TMI EMPLOYEE MANAGEMENT, INC. :

200 North Buckstown Drive : Langhorne, PA 19047 ::

and

TMI HOSPITALITY

MANAGEMENT, INC : <u>COLLECTIVE ACTION ON BEHALF</u>

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

200 North Buckstown Drive : **OF PLAINTIFF AND ALL**

Langhorne, PA 19047 : SIMILARLY SITUATED PERSONS

and

STARWOOD CAPITAL GROUP
591 West Putnam Avenue

Greenwich, CT 06830

Defendants

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Melissa Beideman (*hereinafter* referred to as "Plaintiff"), by and through her undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

I. Introduction

1. Plaintiff has initiated this action to redress violations by Defendant of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA - 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et. seq.*) and applicable state law(s). As a direct consequence of Defendants' unlawful actions, Plaintiff seek damages as set forth herein.

II. Jurisdiction and Venue

2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the claims arise under the laws of the United States. This Court has

supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims because they arise out of the same circumstances and are based upon a common nucleus of operative fact.

- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because of their contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in <u>International Shoe Co. v. Washington</u>, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Venue is properly laid in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), because Defendants reside in and/or conduct business in this judicial district and because a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

III. Parties

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 6. Plaintiff is an adult individual with an address as set forth above.
- 7. Defendant TMI Employee Management, Inc. ("Defendant Management") operates over 100 hotels throughout the United States, including the locations at which Plaintiff (and the putative class of plaintiffs) worked (Springhill Suites in Langhorne, Pennsylvania)
- 8. Defendant TMI Hospitality, Inc. ("Defendant Hospitality") operates over 100 hotels throughout the United States, including the locations at which Plaintiff (and the putative class of plaintiffs) worked (Springhill Suites in Langhorne, Pennsylvania).
- 9. Defendant Starwood Capital Group ("Defendant Starwood") is a is a private equity and venture capital firm specializing in seed, startups, growth capital, buyouts, buyins,

acquisitions, mezzanine, and asset and financial restructuring. The firm also invests in products and services related to the hospitality, recreational, luxury lifestyle retail, other industries assets.¹

- 10. Upon information and belief Defendant TMI Hospitality Inc. and Defendant TMI Employee Management, Inc. were acquired and/or merged with Defendant Starwood Capital Group. Upon further information and belief all Defendants overlapped in management and operations of the location at which Plaintiff and the presumed class of plaintiffs worked. Because of their interrelation of operations, common ownership or management, centralized control of labor relations, common ownership or financial controls, and other factors during Plaintiff's (and the putative class of plaintiffs') employment Defendants were/are sufficiently interrelated and integrated in their activities, labor relations, ownership and management that they may be treated as a single, joint and/or integrated employer for purposes of the instant action.
- 11. Separate and apart Defendant Starwood is also liable herein under the Successor Liability Doctrine as follows:
 - a) Defendant Starwood has been on notice of Plaintiff's potential and actual legal claims, as Defendant Starwood began to engage in the acquisition and/or merger of Defendant Management and Defendant Hospitality in or about June of 2014 and upon information and belief had oversight over the management and operations of the location at which Plaintiff worked since in or about June of 2014 throughout in or about December of 2015 (when she separated from the company). Defendant Starwood still has oversight over the management and operations of the facility at which the putative class of plaintiffs work. Defendant Starwood's aforementioned oversight

¹ Defendant Management, Defendant Hospitality, and Defendant Starwood are *hereinafter* collectively referred to as "Defendants" unless indicated otherwise.

- and management of Plaintiff's (and the presumed class of plaintiffs') work location was sufficient enough to know that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not properly paid overtime in accordance with the FLSA;
- b) Upon information and belief, Defendant Starwood has maintained the entire continuity of operations of Defendant Management and Defendant Hospitality without interruption and performs the identical services for the same clientele with the same underlying employees who worked for Defendants Management and Hospitality; and
- c) Defendant Starwood is in the best and only position to provide relief sought herein as it is unclear at this stage of the litigation whether Defendants Management and Hospitality are capable of providing any relief having divested itself of the business operations which employed Plaintiff (and the putative class of plaintiffs) and its assets therein.
- 12. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through its agents, servants, and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for the benefit of Defendants.

IV. Factual Background

- 13. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 14. Plaintiff (as well as the putative collective class of plaintiffs) to this collective action consist of employees who worked for Defendants dating back 3 years from the filing of the instant lawsuit.

- 15. Plaintiff (as well as the putative class of plaintiffs) to this collective action were employed with Defendants as housekeepers (some of which had different titles including but not limited to "housekeeper" and "executive housekeeper").
- 16. Plaintiff Melissa Beideman (hereinafter "Plaintiff") worked for Defendants for approximately 3.5 years as a housekeeper and an executive housekeeper.
- 17. In or about December of 2015, Plaintiff separated from her employment with Defendants.
- 18. Plaintiff's (as well as the putative class of plaintiffs) job responsibilities consisted general housekeeping duties, hostess duties, and laundry duties (among other various duties assigned by Defendants' management).
- 19. Plaintiff and other similarly situated persons, were paid an hourly rate and were never considered exempt employees under the FLSA.
- 20. Throughout their employment, Plaintiff and other employee's similarly situated to her, worked well over 40 hours per week and often worked (and continue to work) approximately 5-15 hours of overtime per week.
- 21. Plaintiff (as well as the putative class of plaintiffs) were not paid time and one-half for all hours worked over forty (40) hours per week.
- 22. Defendants have and continue to perpetuate a system whereby they intentionally fail to abide by overtime laws, which is evidenced by:
 - Defendants failing to keep proper records of all hours worked by Plaintiff and similarly situated employees;

- ii. Defendants intentionally misrepresenting the amount of hours actually worked by Plaintiff and the putative class of plaintiffs on their bi-weekly paychecks;
- iii. Defendants forcing Plaintiff and the putative class of plaintiffs to clock out before they reached 40 hours, even though they were required to stay longer (beyond 40 hours in one week) in order to finish their job duties;
- iv. Defendants knowingly failing to pay Plaintiff, and the putative class of plaintiffs, time and one half for hours they continued to work past 40 hours in one week after being told they had to clock out.
- 23. Upon information and belief, Defendants maintain across-the-board unlawful pay policies and practices designed and orchestrated to evade federal wage laws and have failed to pay Plaintiff and the putative class of plaintiffs overtime wages.

Count I <u>Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA")</u> (Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation) -Against All Defendants-

- 24. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 25. At all times relevant herein, Defendants have and continue to be an "employer(s)" within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §203 ("FLSA").
- 26. At all times relevant herein, Defendants to this Action was responsible for paying wages to Plaintiff and employees similarly situated to Plaintiff.
- 27. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff, and employees similarly situated to Plaintiff, were employed with Defendants as "employee[s]" within the meaning of the FLSA.

- 28. The FLSA requires covered employers, such as Defendants, to minimally compensate its "non-exempt" employees, such as Plaintiff, 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for each hour that the employee works over 40 in a workweek.
- 29. At all times during their employment with Defendants, Plaintiff, and employees similarly situated to Plaintiff, were "non-exempt" employees within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 30. Defendants' violations of the FLSA as to Plaintiff (and the putative class of plaintiffs) include, but are not limited to:
 - Defendants failing to keep proper records of all hours worked by Plaintiff and similarly situated employees;
 - Defendants intentionally misrepresenting the amount of hours actually worked by Plaintiff and the putative class of plaintiffs on their bi-weekly paychecks;
 - iii. Defendants forcing Plaintiff, and the putative class of plaintiffs, to clock out before they reached 40 hours in one week even though they were required to stay longer in order to finish their duties;
 - iv. Defendants knowingly failing to pay Plaintiff and the putative class of plaintiffs time and one half for hours they continued to work past 40 hours in one week after being told they had to clock out.
- 31. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff the wages and overtime compensation due her (and employees who were similarly situated to her), Defendants violated the FLSA, causing Plaintiff and similarly situated employees to suffer damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

- A. Defendants are to be prohibited from continuing to maintain its illegal policy, practice or custom of unlawfully paying employees and are to be ordered to promulgate an effective policy against such unlawful acts and to adhere thereto;
- B. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to past lost earnings and any other owed compensation. Plaintiff and the presumed classed of plaintiffs should be accorded those benefits illegally withheld from the date they first suffered legal violations at the hands of Defendants until the date of verdict;
- C. Plaintiff and the putative class of plaintiffs are to be awarded liquidated damages, as permitted by applicable law, in an amount determined by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for its willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendants or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- D. Plaintiff and the putative class of plaintiffs are to be accorded any and all other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper and appropriate, including but not limited to, emotional distress and/or pain and suffering damages (where legally permitted);
- E. Plaintiff and the putative class of plaintiffs are to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable legal fees as provided by applicable federal and state law;
- F. Any verdict in favor of Plaintiffs or the putative class of plaintiffs is to be molded by the Court to maximize the financial recovery available to said plaintiffs in light of the caps on certain damages set forth in applicable federal law; and

Plaintiff's and the putative class of plaintiffs' claims are to receive trial by jury to G. the extent allowed by applicable law. Plaintiff has also endorsed this demand on the caption of this Complaint in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b).

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Ari Karpf 3331 Street Road Two Greenwood Square Suite 128 Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: February 5, 2016

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

MELISSA BEID	DEMAN .	•	CIVIL ACTION	•		
v.		;				
TMI EMPLOYEE MANAGEM	ENT, INC., ET AL.	:	NO.			
filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	ase Management To the acopy on all defect ovent that a defend shall, with its first the acopy on a Case Mana	rack Designendants. (So dant does nappearance gement Tra	Reduction Plan of this court, countration Form in all civil cases at the tree § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the root agree with the plaintiff regarding, submit to the clerk of court and second Designation Form specifying the ned.	ime of everse g said		
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CAS	SE MANA	GEMENT TRACKS:			
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security - Cases and Human Services der			n of the Secretary of Health Benefits.	()		
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvexposure to asbestos.	ing claims for pers	sonal injury	or property damage from	()		
the court. (See reverse s	complex and that	need specia	al or intense management by			
management cases.)			•	()		
(f) Standard Management -	Cases that do not	fall into any	y one of the other tracks.	(X)		
$\frac{2 9 2010}{\text{Date}}$	Ari R, Karpf Attorney-at-	law	Plaintiff Attorney for			
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-497	0	akarpf@karpf-law.com			
Telephone	FAX Numb	er	E-Mail Address	······································		
		,				

(Clv. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM t assignment to appropriate calendar.	o be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff. 265 Austin Drive, Fairless Hills, PA 19030	
Address of Defendant: 200 North Buckstown Drive, Langhorne, PA 19	047; 591 West Putnam Avenue, Greenwich, CT 06830
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of business	
(Use Reverse Side Fo.	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.16	a)) Yes 🗆 No 🗷
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yesu No.
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	D.A. Marchard
Case Number:Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	•
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	year previously terminated action in this court?
	Yes□ No□
Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prio action in this court?	r suit pending or within one year previously terminated
	Yes□ No□
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of \underline{a} patent already in suit or any earlier	numbered case pending or within one year proviously
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No□
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rig	hts case filed by the same individual?
	Yes□ No□
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. D FELA	2. D Airplane Personal Injury
3. D Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. D Marine Personal Injury
5. D Patent	5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. A Labor-Management Relations	6. O Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. 🗆 Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
8. D Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. D All other Federal Question Cases	
(Picase specify)	
ARBITRATION CERT	TIFICATION
t, Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record do hereby cert	
M Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and	
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: ZOZOW	ARK2484
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.# 91538
NOTE: A trial do novo will be a trial by jury only if the	ere has been compliance with P.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not possible to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	
DATE: 219120110	ARK2484
Attorney-at-Law	A 66
CIV. 609 (5/2012)	91538

">JS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sneet. (SEE:	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVE	RSE OF THE FORM.)	DEEE	NDANTS				- 	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS TMI EMPLOYEE MANAGEMENT, INC., et al.					
BEIDEMAN, MELISSA				TWILE EMPLOTEE MANAGEMENT, INC., et al.					
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff 1	Bucks	County	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Bucks					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	ame, Address, Telephone Ni	umber and Email Add	ress) N	NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE					
Karpf, Karpf & Ce Two Greenwood PA 19020, (215)	Square, Suite 128	3, Bensalem,	Attorneys		INVOLVED.	,		on or m	
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	III. CITIZENS		RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in (One Box for	r Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government		(Far Diversi						nt) DEF O 4	
U.S. Government Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Anothe	Citizen of Another State				O 5	□ 5
	•		Citizen or Subject Foreign Countr		3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUL	T (Place an "X" in One Box Or	ily)	emakaran mananan en	SUPPLY THE SE	BANGKATA	ZOTTI KIYOVAZIMOM	Marayye des	/SIDYX/AIV AAN	0 5000550414
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Millor Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 441 Voting 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Wolfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	PERSONAL INJUR 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability	Y 610 Agricultur 620 Other Foot 625 Drug Rela 67 Property 630 Liquor Lan 640 R.R. & Tru 650 Airline Re 660 Occupation 8afety/let 690 Other 8afety/let 720 Labor/Mgg 730 Labor/Mgg 730 Labor/Mgg 740 Railway L. 790 Other Labor 791 Empl. Ret. Security A	d & Drug ded Scizure y 21 USC 881 ws uck ggs. nal alth ORAGE T Standards mt. Relations mt. Relations mt. Reporting to Act abor Act or Litigation . Inc. ct AT ONE time - ince	☐ 422 Appea ☐ 423 Within ☐ 28 US ☐ 820 Copyi ☐ 830 Pateni ☐ 840 Trade ☐ 861 BHA (☐ 862 Black ☐ 863 DIW(☐ ☐ 865 RSI (☐ 870 Taxes ☐ 871 IRS— ☐ 26 US	al 28 USC 158 Irawal C 157 EVALORITS ights imark SECURITY Lung (923) C/DIW W (405(g)) Title XVI 105(g)) 15/14/XXIIITS fendant) fendant)	□ 400 State Rd □ 410 Antitrus □ 430 Banks a □ 450 Comme □ 460 Deports □ 470 Rackete □ Corrupt □ 480 Cablu/S □ 810 Selectiv □ 850 Securiti □ Exchang □ 875 Custom □ 12 USC □ 890 Others □ 891 Agricus □ 892 Econom □ 893 Environ □ 894 Energy □ 895 Freedon Act □ 900Appeal c	eapportions at mod Banking rice tition eer Influence Organization eer Credit at TV e Service es/Commod ge Challenge 3410 tatutory Act untal Acts in Stabilization en of Informa of Pet Detenqual Access o titionality of titionality of titionality of ether in the service of the s	ed and ons dities/ tions tions tion Act tters Act attion mination
OT 1 Original	ate Court	Appellate Court	1 4 Reinstated or Reopened	anothe (specif		6 Multidistri	ict 🗆 7 🖟	appeal to E udge from Augistrate udgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Fair Labor and St Brief description of ca Violations of the	tute under which you at tandards Act "FLS use: FLSA and applic:	SA" (29USC201 able state laws.)					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	O CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	DEMAND \$			HECK YES only in the second of	if demanded in Y Yes	complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS		JUDGE			DOCKE	r number			
Explanation: 2/0/2	OIV			hand the best parts					
DATE		SIGNATURE OF	FATTORNEY OF	RECORD					

Save As... Export as PDF

Retrieve PDF File

Reset